

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed April 1, 2005. Claims 76-84 are pending. Applicants wish to thank Examiners Dye, Dicus and Speer for the many courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives Farmer and Schneider during an interview on 29 June 2005. The substance of the interview is correctly set forth in the Interview Summary.

First, as noted at the interview, the undersigned wishes to correct the remarks made in the Amendment filed 16 December 2004 relative to the patent to Boire. The Boire patent does make reference to coloured glass and the data in the tables (the examples of Boire relative to the comparative examples) indicates an increase in T_L and a decrease or no change in T_E . The undersigned apologizes for the prior erroneous statements.

The Boire document is differentiated from the claimed invention in the present application which refers, *inter alia*, to a decrease in T_L . The Examiner has kindly agreed, as set forth in the Interview Summary, that the rejections over Boire would be withdrawn.

The rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. § 103 is again traversed.

The Official Action of April 1, 2005 indicated (bottom of page 2 and top of page 3) that the Terneu et al document would be removed as a reference if one of two alternatives were demonstrated. The second of the two alternatives was "that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person."

As set forth in the Statutory Declaration of Guy Farmer filed concurrently, "the subject matter of the reference (Terneu et al) and the subject matter of the invention claimed in the present application were, at the time the invention of the present application was made, owned by the same entity, Glaverbel".


Accordingly, Applicants have complied with the requirement in the Official Action and the present rejections based upon Terneu et al must be withdrawn.

Applicants maintain that the combination of Krumwiede and Terneu was not proper when the prior art documents are considered in that, *inter alia*, there was no motivation to combine, but for administrative convenience Applicants have demonstrated the "common ownership" as required by the Official Action. Accordingly, the rejection (and Applicants' traversal) are moot.

Reconsideration and allowance are solicited. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that an interview will expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged and requested to contact Applicants' attorney at the telephone number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP



Jerold I. Schneider
Registration No. 24,765

1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-2412
Telephone No. (202) 861-3900
Facsimile No. (202) 223-2085

G